

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 18 were pending in this application and were objected to or rejected.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 9, and 13 and has added claims 19-32.

Applicant respectfully acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, 9-10, 12-15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by LaRowe. Claim 1 as amended recites "*receiv[ing] information from a structuring system via a system communication network*" and "*transmit[ting] said information received from the structuring system on demand to a portable computing device*." Claim 1 further recites transceiver protocol stacks that include "*a first module configured to direct said transceiver system to generate a beacon*," "*a second module configured to direct said transceiver system to detect an acknowledgement signal generated, in response to said beacon, by said portable computing device*," and "*a third module configured to direct said transceiver system to generate, in response to said acknowledgement signal, a broadcast incorporating said information received from the structuring system*." By receiving the information from the structuring system, the information distributor is now able to cache the received information for subsequently distributing the information on demand to a portable computing device located within the information distributor's transmission range. As a result, the information distributor can deliver the cached information to multiple portable computing devices such that the portable computing devices are able to receive information more easily without having to sequentially download the information directly from an information provider.

LaRowe does not disclose claim 1 as amended. Instead, LaRowe merely discloses a conventional personal area network consisting of a hub device connected to multiple peripheral devices. The hub device establishes communication sessions with the multiple peripheral devices using a specific communications protocol. Specifically, LaRowe discloses:

A communications protocol . . . includes a synchronization beacon frame that is broadcast by the hub device to the peripheral devices for permitting the peripheral devices to synchronize to the network, a token frame that is broadcast by the hub device to the peripheral devices for allocating network bandwidth among the peripheral devices, a status response frame that is transmitted by the peripheral devices to the hub device for indicating whether the peripheral devices have data to transmit to the hub device, and a data frame. . . . includ[ing] data transmitted between the hub device and the peripheral devices.

(Abstract)

LaRowe fails to disclose that the hub device receives information from a structuring system or any other system and transmits the received information to the peripheral devices. LaRowe also fails to disclose that the hub device receives information from a particular peripheral device and transmits the same information to another peripheral device. LaRowe further fails to disclose a three-module structure, including a first module of transceiver protocol stacks configured to direct a transceiver system to generate a beacon, a second module of the transceiver protocol stacks configured to direct the transceiver system to detect an acknowledgement signal, and a third module of the transceiver protocol stacks configured to direct the transceiver system to generate a broadcast. Instead, LaRowe merely discloses a specific communications protocol for establishing and maintaining a communications session between the hub device and a peripheral device. Thus, in LaRowe, the hub device does not transmit information received from a structuring system to a peripheral device such that the peripheral device receives the information without having to download it directly from an information provider. The hub device of LaRowe also does not have three different modules, including a first module configured to direct a transceiver system to generate a beacon, a second module configured to direct the transceiver system to detect an acknowledgement signal, and a third module configured to direct the transceiver system to generate a broadcast.

Accordingly, claim 1 as amended is patentable over LaRowe.

Dependent claims 2-8 are also patentable over LaRowe both because they depend from patentable independent claim 1 as well as additionally reciting their own patentable features. For example, claim 4 recites *“a fourth module configured to direct said transceiver system to generate said beacon by boosting a base signal power level to increase transmission range of said beacon;”* claim 6 recites *“a sixth module configured to direct said transceiver system to generate said broadcast by boosting a base signal power level to increase transmission range of said broadcast.”* Neither of these limitations pertaining to a module that increases transmission range is disclosed by LaRowe.

Claim 9, amended to recite *“a first module configured to switch said network receiver from said sleep mode to said active mode to receive a first scheduled transmission from a structuring system via a system communication network,”* *“a second module configured to switch said network receiver from said active mode to said sleep mode after receiving said first scheduled transmission,”* and *“a third module configured to direct said transceiver system to transmit said information received from the structuring system on demand to a portable computing device”* is also patentable over LaRowe. In particular, the hub device of LaRowe does not transmit information received from a structuring system to a peripheral device such that the peripheral device receives the information without having to download it directly from an information provider. The hub device of LaRowe also does not have a three-module structure, including a first module of a memory configured to switch a network receiver from a sleep mode to an active mode, a second module of the memory configured to switch the network receiver from the active mode to the sleep mode, and a third module of the memory configured to direct a transceiver system to transmit information received from a structuring system on demand to a portable computing device.

Dependent claims 10-12 are patentable over LaRowe both because they depend from patentable independent claim 9 as well as additionally reciting their own patentable features.

Claim 13, amended to recite *“receiving information from a structuring system via a system communication network”* and *“transmitting said information received from the*

structuring system on demand to a portable computing device,” is patentable over LaRowe for reasons analogous to those set forth above with claim 1.

Dependent claims 14-18 are patentable over LaRowe both because they depend from patentable independent claim 13 as well as additionally reciting their own patentable features. For example, claim 15 recites “*boosting a base signal power level to increase transmission range of said beacon;*” claim 17 recites “*boosting a base signal power level to increase transmission range of said broadcast.*” Neither of these limitations pertaining to the “increased transmission range” is disclosed by LaRowe.

The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaRowe. As shown above, LaRowe fails to disclose *receiving information from a structuring system via a system communication network and transmitting said information received from the structuring system on demand to a portable computing device.* Applicant submits that there is no suggestion to combine the communications protocol disclosed by LaRowe with an amplitude-shift-keying modulated signal. Furthermore, an amplitude-shift-keying modulated signal does not remedy the deficiencies of LaRowe discussed above. Particularly, the communications protocol of LaRowe in combination with an amplitude-shift-keying modulated signal fail to provide the benefit of the claimed limitation because the hub device still does not transmit information received from a structuring system to a peripheral device such that the peripheral device receives the information without having to download it directly from an information provider. Accordingly, claims 5 and 16 are patentable.

The Examiner also rejected claims 7, 8, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaRowe in view of Shvodian. Shvodian does not remedy the deficiencies of LaRowe discussed above. At best, LaRowe in combination with Shvodian suggest a communications protocol using an infrared signal. However, this fails to provide the benefit of the claimed limitation because the hub device still does not transmit information received from a structuring system to a peripheral device such that the peripheral device receives the information

without having to download it directly from an information provider. Accordingly, claims 7, 8, and 18 are patentable over the combination of LaRowe and Shvodian.

Claims 19-32 are added by this Amendment A. Applicant submits that claims 19-32 include similar limitations as claims 1-18 and accordingly are patentable over the cited references.

In sum, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 through 32, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration of the basis for the rejections and requests allowance of these claims.

In addition, Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
SAUL KATO

Dated: 12/2/04

By: Greg T. Sueoka 
Greg T. Sueoka
Registration No. 33,800
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7194
Fax.: (650) 938-5200